

University of Groningen

Notiunculae Martyrologicae

Bremmer, Jan; Boeft, Jan den

Published in:
Vigilae Christianae

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
1985

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Bremmer, J., & Boeft, J. D. (1985). Notiunculae Martyrologicae. *Vigilae Christianae*.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

NOTIUNCULAE MARTYROLOGICAE III

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE MARTYRIA OF POLYCARP AND PIONIUS

BY

JAN DEN BOEFT AND JAN BREMMER

We continue our series of notes on some of the *Acta Martyrum* with observations on two Smyranean martyria, viz. of Polycarp and Pionius.¹ Again we follow the order of Musurillo's edition.

Martyrium Polycarpi 11-12. In these paragraphs the proconsul continues his interrogation of Polycarp. Having first appealed to the bishop's old age, he now proceeds to the use of more threatening language: "I have wild animals, and I shall expose you to them if you do not change your mind" (c. 11.1, tr. Musurillo). However, after the herald had announced Polycarp's confession, the mob did not ask the proconsul for his animals, but they shouted and asked the Asiarch Philip to set loose a lion on Polycarp. Why did they not request the proconsul to do so? The mob knew, of course—and Polycarp himself must also have known this—that Roman governors did not travel around with a small zoo. For the execution of criminals they were always dependent on the cities in which they temporarily resided to put on wild beast shows. There is a nice parallel for this state of affairs in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*. In Corinth, when the governor had heard and condemned to death a female poisoner, the woman had to die in a show put on at the occasion of a citizen becoming a *duumvir quinquennalis*, not at a show given by the proconsul.²

This procedure also helps us to understand a passage from the *Martyrium Pionii* (c. 18), where we read the following: "Terentius, who at that time gave the hunting games, said to Asclepiades: After your condemnation I shall ask for you to compete in the gladiatorial games given by my son".³ Here, too, the Christian, when convicted, will not appear in a show given by the proconsul, but in games given by Terentius' son. It is interesting to note that in this particular case the son participates in his father's games. Most likely, he was still an adolescent, since the

father will ask for the Christian. If this is indeed true, it would be one more illustration of the tendency of the *élite* in Late Antiquity to promote the career of their children at an early age.⁴

Unfortunately, we do not know exactly what kind of games had been presided over by Philip the Asiarch. They may well have been the games of the *Κοινὰ Ἀσία* but a private liturgy of the Asiarch cannot completely be excluded.⁵

Martyrium Polycarpi 12. In the paragraphs 9-11 of this Martyrium the altercation between Polycarp and the proconsul before whom he was brought in the amphitheatre, is reported. The proconsul, who failed in his attempts to persuade Polycarp to swear by the Emperor's *genius*,⁶ finally adopts the tactics of intimidation: first he threatens with the wild beasts and then, in the absence of any fear on the part of the bishop, he announces the latter's execution at the stake. Even this does not perturb Polycarp, on the contrary, he taunts the proconsul to go ahead and he shows himself full of confidence ὥστε 06 μόνον μὴ συμπεσεῖν, ταραχθέντα ὑπὸ τῶν λεγομένων πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀλλὰ τοῦναντίον τὸν ἀνθύπατον ἐκστῆναι, πέμψαι τε τὸν ἑαυτοῦ κήρυκα ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ σταδίου κηρῦξαι τρίς· Πολύκαρπος ὡμολόγησεν ἑαυτὸν Χριστιανὸν εἶναι (par. 12.1 in Dehandschutter's text)." In the last part of this quotation there is a problem of punctuation, viz. has τρίς to be taken with κηρῦξαι or does it rather belong to the announcement itself: τρίς Πολύκαρπος κτλ? "Voilà une virgule qui promet de faire couler de l'encre": H. Delehayé said some eighty years ago.⁸ It may indeed be worthwhile to spend some ink on this problem. Delehayé's remark was occasioned by the recent edition of the first half of Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica* by E. Schwartz (GCS 9.1, Berlin 1903). In this edition the final part of HE IV 15.25, which is the exact parallel of the passage in the *Martyrium Polycarpi* just quoted, runs as follows: τρίς Πολύκαρπος ὡμολόγησεν ἑαυτὸν Χριστιανὸν εἶναι. Presumably Schwartz' punctuation was largely prompted by Rufinus' translation: *misso igitur curione ad populum iubet uoce maxima protestari Polycarpum tertio confessum Christianum se esse*. This translation had already been criticized in a note in *Acta Sanctorum* Ian. III page 319.⁹ Eb. Nestle, on his part, immediately noticed Schwartz' change in the usual punctuation of the Greek text and gave expression to his grave doubts, which were mainly fed by the way in which the Syrian translation had interpreted the text.¹⁰ Nestle's note was next reported by Delehayé, whose remark has been quoted above.

First it has to be stressed that syntactically and stylistically in neither case any exception can be taken to the placing of $\tau\pi\lambda\varsigma$: both a position at the end and at the beginning of a phrase is feasible, either provides some special emphasis to the **adverb**.¹¹ So, further arguments are needed to make a choice.

The number three played a large part in different fields of ancient society, such as religion (e.g. 'Göttertriaden', Latte, RRG 151), oaths (R. Hirzel, *Der Eid* 82 sqq.), law (*tres faciunt collegium*), death and burial (*magna manis* ter uoce uocauit, Aen. 5.506). Excellent surveys are provided by R. Mehrlein's article 'Drei' (RAC 4.269-310) and G. Deling's lemma $\tau\pi\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, $\tau\pi\lambda\varsigma$, $\tau\pi\lambda\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ (TWNT 8.215-225). For the solution of our problem the following summarizing phrase in the last-mentioned article is very helpful: "Die dreifache Ausführung einer **Handlung** macht sie **endgültig** wirksam; das dreifache Aussprechen eines Wortes, einer **Wendung**, eines Satzes gibt ihnen volle Gültigkeit und Kraft". Considering the emphasis laid on $\tau\pi\lambda\varsigma$, it would seem that the 'volle Gültigkeit und Kraft' suit the confession of Polycarp much better than the announcement by the herald. Put into other words; it is far more likely that the contents of the announcement are stressed than any repetition of this announcement.

But is a threefold confession a normal phenomenon? Dehandschutter, following W. Schoedel, refers to Pliny, Ep. 96.3: *Confitentes iterum ac tertio interrogauit supplicium minatus*: *perseuerantes duci iussi*. This reference is most relevant, for, as had repeatedly been pointed out, in the absence of any official and uniform rule provincial governors dealing with Christians may well have followed the example set by Pliny, which had been approved by Trajan's rescript.¹² Pliny's correspondence was available, and it seems fair to assume that the proconsul who tried Polycarp in the middle of the second century, took a leaf out of the book of a famous predecessor of some forty or fifty years before.

Now it might be objected that in what precedes it is stated only once that Polycarp proclaimed himself a Christian, viz. in par. 10.1: $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\iota\alpha\nu\acute{o}\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\mu\iota$. This confession can be found in many Acts of the Martyrs and it is also often hinted at in apologetic literature. There is, however, a difference in its place within the proceedings. In some cases the accused makes this statement straightaway at the beginning (e.g. Acts of Carpus and Papyrus 3 and 5, Perpetua 6.4, Cyprian 1.2), but in others the declaration is the climax of the hearing, following the refusal

to comply with the demand to partake in pagan ritual (*Scillitani* 9, *Justinus* 3.4). In the refusal of course the confession is implied, it is only made explicit at a later stage. That is exactly the case with Polycarp, too. Thrice the proconsul invites him to swear by the Emperor's genius: "Ὁμοσον τὴν Καίσαρος τύχην."¹³ Each time Polycarp refuses, the third time emphatically adding: μετὰ παρρησίας ἄκουε· Χριστιανός εἰμι. In itself this is decisive, but the proconsul wants to make absolutely sure, and therefore he threatens Polycarp first with exposure to the wild beasts and next with death at the stake, both times adding: ἐὰν μὴ μετανοήσης (11.1 and 2). The proconsul's first invitation to swear (9.2) had already been accompanied by this same urge: μετανόησον, so that this element of the proceedings is in fact also threefold. By three refusals to swear, the third time combined with the explicit confession of his being a Christian, and three refusals to recant, Polycarp must have convinced the proconsul of the absolute finality of his confession. The latter was now fully entitled to announce officially: τρίς Πολύκαρπος ὡμολόγησεν ἑαυτὸν Χριστιανὸν εἶναι.

Martyrium Pionii 1.1. The opening phrase of this Passion (Ταῖς μνείαις τῶν ἁγίων κοινωνεῖν ὁ ἀπόστολος παραινεῖ) refers to Rom. 12.13, where the text now generally accepted, however, has *χρεῖαις* instead of *μνείαις*. Some New Testament manuscripts provide the reading *μνείαις*, which was also followed in some Old Latin versions, as Rufinus noted: 'Usibus sanctorum communicantes'. *Memini* in *Latinis* exemplaribus *magis* haberi: 'Memoriis sanctorum communicantes' (Origenes, Comm. in Ep. ad Rom. IX 12).¹⁴ It found favour with some modern scholars, e.g. Th. Zahn ad *loc.*, who thought an interpretation suiting the context to be feasible: "Darunter konnte ein Gedenken im Gebet verstanden werden, aber ebensowohl ein tatsächliches, in freundlicher Unterstüttzung zum Ausdruck gebrachtes *Gedenken*".¹⁵ This seems rather far-fetched, the reference to practical help is obvious, and undoubtedly *χρεῖαις* is the most likely term in that respect. In his note ad *loc.* C.E.B. Cranfield puts forward some suggestions as to the origin of the variant *μνείαις*, concluding that this reading, "once in existence, would establish itself quite easily at a time when ἅγιοι tended to mean the 'saints' of the past who were commemorated *solemnly*".¹⁶ This formula exactly fits the phrase we are dealing with. As can be gathered from *Biblia Patristica I-III* it may well be the first extant testimony of this variant.

The remembrance called for in the words just treated is due to those saints who have lived up to the highest standards: τῶν ὑγιῶς μετὰ καρδίας ἀπάσης ἐν πίστει διαγενομένων. In this expression the addition of the word ὑγιῶς is rather striking, for μετὰ καρδίας ἀπάσης and ἐν πίστει would seem quite sufficient to denote the true ἄγιοι.

The use of ὑγιής (and its cognate verb ὑγιαίνειν) in a non-physical sense is attested very early in Greek texts: the first example is provided by the only occurrence in Homer (*Il.* 8.524); Herodotus has a few more (e.g. *I* 8.3, where Gyges calls Candaules' famous suggestion λόγον οὐκ ὑγιέα); Plato uses ὑγιής in philosophical contexts, e.g. θαυμάζουσιν ἂν οὖν, εἰ οἱ ἄπειροι ἀληθείας ... μὴ ὑγιεῖς δόξας ἔχουσιν; (*Resp.* 584E). So ὑγιής can be used to state that a particular (philosophical) doctrine is correct and justified. In such a way Epictetus too makes use of the word, e.g. *I* 12.4: πολὺ πρότερον οὖν ἀναγκαῖόν ἐστι περὶ ἐκάστον τούτων ἐπισκέφθαι, πότῃ ὑγιῶς ἢ οὐκ ὑγιῶς λεγόμενον ἐστι. Transferred to the context of Christian doctrine and confession, the word could well denote orthodoxy¹⁷ and the pious author may have wanted to stress the fact that Pionius belongs to the true orthodox saints.

This explanation is not quite satisfactory, since ἐν πίστει διαγενομένων already expresses such an idea sufficiently. Therefore we venture to suggest another possibility. In the New Testament the adjective ὑγιής is used once in a non-physical sense (Tit. 2.8), the verb ὑγιαίνειν occurs eight times with such a meaning (in seven cases it is the present participle). All instances can be found in the Pastoral Epistles.¹⁸ Commenting on the first occurrence (εἴ τι ἕτερον τῇ ὑγιαίνουσῃ διδασκαλίᾳ, 1 Tim. 1.10), J. N. D. Kelly says that the relevant expression is used here "to designate the authentic Christian message as applied to conduct".¹⁹ This is a very apt formula in that it has in view the ethical implications of Christian belief and doctrine. A fine parallel is provided by Tit. 2.1, where Titus is urged to teach according to the ὑγιαίνουσα διδασκαλία. In the elaboration of this exhortation specific ethical commandments are mentioned. Kelly *ad loc.* rightly notes that "the basis of good behaviour is correct belief". If this can be applied to the expression we are commenting upon, the hagiographer is defining the saints as people, 'who wholeheartedly uphold the Christian faith with all the consequences for moral conduct'. Pionius belonged to this category, for he was an ἀποστολικὸς ἀνὴρ (1.2). In support of this 'ethical' interpretation, we may add that in a number of inscriptions magistrates are praised, because they ὑγιῶς carried out their duties. In these cases ὑγιῶς means 'avec rec-

titude, *probité*', as Louis Robert has shown.²⁰ Our hagiographer may well have been influenced by this use of ὕγιως, too.²¹

Martyrium Pionii 2.2 6 οὖν Πιόνιος πρὸ μιᾶς ἡμέρας τῶν Πολυκάρπου γενεθλίων εἶδεν ὅτι δεῖ ταύτῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ αὐτοῦς συλληφθῆναι. In the next paragraph this statement is summarized: ὡς εἶδεν ὅτι αὐριον δεῖ αὐτοῦς συλληφθῆναι. The use of εἶδεν is remarkable, not the least because of its being repeated, which shows it was not an inadequate term due to a slip of thought, as Musurillo presumably suspected, judging from his translations: "Pionius knew ..." and "he realized" respectively. But ὁρᾶν and its aorist εἶδεν always denote sense-perception, literally or figuratively, so that one has to render 'he saw', 'he perceived' or something similar. One could indeed envisage that Pionius is pictured as 'knowing' his destiny, but in that case at least the aorist is rather difficult to understand. It is much more likely that Pionius 'saw' that he was to be arrested on the next day. How did he see this? Now δεῖ obviously refers to 'divine destiny or unavoidable fate'.²² In view of the meaning of δεῖ, a prophesying dream or vision seems quite feasible. It must be admitted that the mere use of εἶδεν without the support of any specifying term, such as ὁπτασία or ἐνύπνιον, is a little suspect. But concerning a man who clearly took example by his famous Smyrnaean predecessor Polycarp this is perhaps less strange. The latter also had a vision before his arrest, from which he concluded: δεῖ με ζῶντα κατῆναι. The Latin version of Pionius' Passion found no fault with this explanation: uidit in *somnis sequenti* die *se esse capiendum*,²³ neither did the Armenian version: "der Priester Pionius sah am Tage vor dem Gedachtnistag des Polykarp im Traum".²⁴

Martyrium Pionii 4.17-23. In his first oration, which was addressed to pagans and Jews, Pionius stressed that the end of the world was imminent. He illustrated this argument in an interesting way by telling about his journey to the region of the Dead Sea.²⁵ In great detail he pictured the desolate situation of the land and the curious qualities of the sea which could not nurture any living creature, and also pushed upwards anything thrust into it. Having noted that this was something far away, he then proceeded ὑμεῖς ὁρᾶτε καὶ διηγεῖσθε Λυδίας γῆν Δεκαπόλεως κεκαυμένην πυρὶ καὶ προκειμένην εἰς δεῦρο ὑπόδειγμα ἀσεβῶν, Αἰτνης καὶ Σικελίας καὶ προσέτι Λυκίας καὶ τῶν νήσων ῥοιγδούμενον πῦρ. Musurillo translates these lines without any comment, but Robert argues that the

passage contains some **interpolations**.²⁶ First, he observes that a Lydian Decapolis does not exist; the term must be a gloss, intruded from a note on the description of the Dead Sea region. This observation, we may add, is confirmed by the fact that the fifth-century (Srapian, n. 24, p. 377) Armenian translation indeed makes no mention of the Lydian Decapolis. Robert also wants to remove the Aetna, arguing that Pionius stated that he was now going to speak about phenomena nearer at home. However, although the Aetna was not literally nearby, the vulcano must have been well known to his audience, if not from sight, at least from the literature, whereas the Dead Sea region, judging from the detailed description, was evidently supposed to be unknown to his audience—an interesting testimony of the geographical horizon of Pionius' listeners.

The scorched area near at hand, the **Katakekaumenê**, was situated only about a hundred kilometers away from Smyrna, and must have been familiar to Pionius' audience. The area, according to the martyr, remained in the present condition **ὑπόδειγμα ἀσεβῶν**. Musurillo translates these words with 'as an example of man's impiety', but the actual meaning is, as L. Robert translates 'en exemple pour les **impies**'. Neither scholar, however, notes that the expression is a straight quotation from 2 Pet. 2.6, where God is said to have covered **Sodom** and Gomorrah with ashes **ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβεῖν**.

As a scientist avant la lettre Pionius subsequently argued that the occurrence of hot water springs in the **Katakekaumenê** presupposed the existence of subterranean fire. After mentioning water and fire he then proceeded to remind his audience of the **ἐκπυρώσεις μερικὰς καὶ ἐξυδατώσεις, ὡς ὑμεῖς ἐπὶ Δευκαλίωνος ἢ ὡς ἡμεῖς ἐπὶ Νῶε** as portents of the last judgement. Although his touching the partial conflagrations and floods relatively smoothly follows from his preceding argument, two other factors may also have been of influence for this combination. First, in Peter's letter, the mention of **Sodom** and Gomorrah is immediately preceded by the mention of Noah (2 Pet. 2.5). Secondly, the erudite Pionius will also have known the combination of (partial) floods and conflagrations from the philosophical tradition, since Plato (Tim. 22C), Philolaus (44A 18DK, cf. W. Burkert, *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism*, Cambridge Mass. 1972, 315 n. 86) and the Stoa (Sen.NQ.3.27-30, Cons. Marc.26.6; Origen C. Cels.4.64) all mention the combination of the destructive forces of water and **fire**.²⁷

Pionius illustrated his reference to floods by mentioning the Greek hero Deucalion whom he compared to Noah. Did his pagan listeners have the background to understand who Noah was? We must assume that Pionius thought this to be the case. The first part of his oration contains numerous examples which would have baffled an outsider. To give one example, without a considerable knowledge of Judaism, who would have known what forced the Jews to sacrifice to Baal-Peor (c.4.11)? Pionius' presupposition can hardly have been wrong. The number of Jews living in Smyrna was considerable. They are already mentioned in Revelation (2.9), and their presence has been confirmed by the epigraphical **evidence**.²⁸ Moreover, their presence in Asia Minor was not unique. In the last decades, Louis Robert has greatly increased our knowledge of Jewish life in Asia Minor by his studies of inscriptions from, i.a., Tralles, Ephesus, Sardes, Eumeneia and **Akmonia**.²⁹ He has shown that in these places the Jews were not at all treated as pariahs, but in many cases they even occupied important magistracies. Their influence must have been considerable in Phrygian Apamea-Kibotos, because in the early third century this city struck coins showing Noah and his wife in the Ark." The issue reflects a Jewish legend which we also find in the Jewish substratum of the first book of the *Oracula Sibyllina* where Noah proclaims Phrygia as the first land to emerge after the Flood." This must mean that this particular version of the Flood will have been known in wide stretches of Asia Minor. For those interested enough to listen to Pionius, Noah most likely was a name which did not need any **explanation**.³²

Martyrium Pionii c. 13. After Pionius had reprovably observed that some of his fellow Christians had been invited to the Jewish synagogues, he mentioned one of the assertions of the Jews. Apparently, they contended that Jesus was a biothanes. Moreover, the Jews λέγουσι δὲ καὶ νεκρομαντεῖαν πεποιηχέναι καὶ ἀνηγειοχέναι³³ τὸν Χριστὸν μετὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ. Musurillo translates these words as follows: "they assert that Christ performed necromancy or spirit-divination with the cross". As J. and L. Robert recently observed, this translation totally misses the mark. The Jews actually assert "that they performed necromancy and that they brought up Christ with the **cross**".³⁴ At least three aspects of this rather surprising statement seem noteworthy. First, S. Gero has compared this passage with a passage in the Talmudic treatise *Gittin*, in which it is told that a certain Onqelos bar Qaloniqos summoned up by

necromancy three arch-enemies of Israel: Titus, Balaam and Jesus.³⁵ Even though this passage may have some connection with the assertions quoted by Pionius, the latter are more in the mainstream of ancient belief, since to perform necromancy with biothanati was normal practice in Antiquity; Titus, on the other hand, was not a biothanatus. Secondly, death on the cross was the *servile supplicium* par excellence. By mentioning the cross the Jews tried to discredit Jesus even more than by calling him only a βιοθανής. A crucified βιοθανής surely was the lowest of the lowest.³⁶ Thirdly, it is a widespread conception that the deceased appear in the state in which they have died. Odysseus, when entering the Underworld, saw warriors with their deadly wounds and bloody arms (*Od.* 11.40-41). Aeschylus (*Eumenides* 103) has the shade of Clytemnestra display her death wounds, and Plato (*Gorgias* 524-25) even refines the idea by adding that the soul retains the scars of its former existence.³⁷ Sometimes the dead even appeared with the instrument by which they had been killed. This belief evidently constitutes the background to the assertion that Jesus appeared with the cross.³⁸ It also explains a curious passage in the *Passio Fructuosi* c. 5. Here we read that Fructuosus and his fellow martyrs were seen rising up to heaven *adhuc stipitibus, quibus ligati fuerant, permanentibus*.

Martyrium Pionii c. 15. After Pionius had encouraged his fellow Christians, the neokoros **Polemon** and the hipparchos Theophilus tried to persuade him to sacrifice. Both men belonged to the upper-class of Smyrna. **Polemon** was most likely a descendant of a king of Pontus and the famous sophist **Polemon** from Hadrianic times.³⁹ Although his function, neokoros, is given, it is unfortunately not stated to which temple he was attached. We know of Smyranean neokoroi in the service of Zeus (*IGR* IV 1397), Dionysos (*I. Smyrna* 515), the Nemeseis (*CIG* 3193), and the imperial cult (*IGR* IV 1433). Considering the important function of **Polemon** and the fact that the temple of the imperial cult is sometimes plainly referred to in inscriptions as 'the temple',⁴⁰ it is most likely that **Polemon** was the neokoros of the imperial cult; the temple of the Nemeseis is not to be completely excluded, though, since it is in the Nemeseion that Pionius has to sacrifice (c. 15).⁴¹ About Theophilus nothing else is known, but his position, hipparchos, was obviously important and it is regularly mentioned in Smyranean inscriptions.⁴²

Both men tried to deceive Pionius by pretending that the proconsul had sent someone to transfer him to Ephesus. Pionius was not im-

pressed and asked his opponents to show him this officer. This annoyed Theophilus, who answered: 'Ἀλλὰ πρίγκιψ ἐστὶν ἀξιόλογος· εἰ δὲ οὐ θέλεις, ἄρχων εἶμι. Musurillo translates this sentence: 'An imperial officer is worthy of respect! Whether you will or not, I am in charge!' Except for the clumsy translation of princeps, Musurillo is followed by Lanata in that both consider princeps to refer to the proconsular official. In itself this is not unreasonable, since also Cyprian was fetched by two *principes* of the proconsular officium (Passio Cypriani 2.2, 4). On the other hand, it would be strange if Theophilus attached too much weight to his figment of imagination, and princeps can also refer to himself. Evidently this was also the opinion of the Armenian version—"Aber der erste der Gesandten ist wertvoller"—and the Latin translation of the Bollandists—atqui princeps, *inquit* Magister equitum, *dignus* est cui *fides* habeatur. Atqui Princeps, *inquit*, sum (Ruinar's text is more in line with Musurillo's translation)—, and this has recently also been advocated by M. Speidel.⁴³ The hipparchos had apparently taken over the title from the imperial army. This may have gone hand in hand with the growing importance of his duty (not surprising in the chaotic third century), since it is noteworthy that Theophilus seems to be in charge of the diognitae, who at the time of Polycarp (*MPol.* 6, 8) were under command of an *eirenarchos*.⁴⁴

This short altercation gives some important information which has been overlooked in recent studies of the Roman administration of justice in Asia.⁴⁵ We know that the proconsul went on an annual assize-tour along the various conventus of his province. In Egypt this trip was always made in the same order when visiting the various cities.⁴⁶ What about Asia? Pionius was arrested on the anniversary of Polycarp's death, i.e. February 23. He was executed on March 12, and apparently a few days before that date the proconsul had arrived in Smyrna (c. 19). It seems reasonable to infer from the attempt at deceiving Pionius that before going to Smyrna the governor had resided in Ephesus. Both times, then, he arrived in Smyrna around the beginning of March. The date and order of his visits is supported by Aelius Aristides, who describes his dealings with the proconsul Severus as starting in the winter. He then followed the governor from Ephesus to Smyrna, and subsequently to Pergamum.⁴⁷ Apparently, the governor toured the more coastal cities in the winter and the more inland cities during the summer, when they would be better accessible. A consideration of this order may well further our insight in this complicated problem.

Martyrium Pionii 17. This Martyrium can be divided into two parts, which are built up quite similarly. Both halves end with an official interrogation (9.1: ἐγγράφως, 19.1: γενομένων ὑπομνημάτων <ὕπό> τῶν ἐπιτεταγμένων) by the chairman of the commission supervising the obligatory sacrifices and the proconsul respectively. Either hearing is followed by the measures decided upon and preceded by a) a long speech by Pionius, and b) attempts by notable citizens to dissuade Pionius from his pernicious course. One of these attempts is sketched in the short paragraph we now want to comment upon.

Rufinus, a rhetor of some local distinction, urges Pionius to stop and not to continue in his vainglorious conduct (μὴ ξενοδόξει). As if bitten by a viper, Pionius reacts to this unkind adhortation by asking aggressively whether such conduct towards a defendant is the fruit of the man's rhetoric occupation. It is even worse than what happened to **Socrates** in Athens! At Smyrna everybody seems to be eager and ready to accuse like Anytus and **Meletus**!

This is an interesting passage in more than one respect. First, we actually also know Rufinus from other sources of the period. His father undoubtedly was the well known Smyranean sophist Claudius Rufinus, who was the teacher of the famous sophist Hermocrates (Philostr. *VS.* 2.25.1). The son Rufinus appears on coins of the time of **Gordian**.⁴⁸ Evidently, the son had taken over the profession of the father, since Pionius calls him τις ... τῶν ἐν τῇ ῥητορικῇ διαφέρειν δοκούντων. Now Rufinus' insult earned him Pionius' sarcastic reference to his rhetorical profession. **Ramsay MacMullen** has explained this sharp altercation from a development in the fourth century, when regularly "coloro **che** non conoscevano nulla della cultura mondana potevano addirittura essere giudicati vittoriosi in un dibattito con i 'filosofi' ".⁴⁹ But Pionius is not all an uncultured fellow. On the contrary, the *Passio* shows him to be a selfconfident and erudite intellectual (see also our last note). That is why we look into a different direction.

In antiquity there were grosso **modo** two forms of higher education and intellectual pursuit, viz. rhetoric and philosophy. Although not necessarily in a vehement form, they were each other's rivals. Those who had chosen philosophy tended to think rhetoric was concerned with mere externals and did not pay enough serious attention to truth; the representatives of rhetoric had their negative ideas about philosophers. In the time of Pionius the balance of influence had tipped towards the practitioners of rhetoric. After the early third century we hardly hear

anything anymore about the occupants of the philosophical chairs in Athens, cities stop funding professorships in philosophy, and the immunities which had been customarily granted to philosophers were gradually withdrawn. It is against this background that we must see Pionius' second reference to Socrates. This is not an otiose repetition, but it means to emphasize that philosophy provided the strength to endure in the face of injustice, whereas clearly rhetoric is only able to teach the methods of accusation and **prosecution**.⁵⁰

In early Christian apologetic literature the case of **Socrates** is quite often introduced as an illustrative example of grave injustice done to a wise and just man; **Socrates** is even pictured as a forerunner of the Christian martyrs. Good surveys of this matter are provided by E. Benz and K. Döring.⁵¹ Their treatment of the paragraph under discussion, however, leaves something to be desired. Döring restricts himself to a short paraphrase, merely adding that the episode "deutlich den Einfluss der kynisch-stoischen Popularphilosophie verrät" (146), Benz' explanation (216/7) is hampered by his misunderstanding of the situation. He thinks that Rufinus "sich mit einem beleidigenden Zwischenruf in die Verhandlung einmischt ohne rechtens mit der Prozessführung beauftragt zu sein". But, as we have indicated, the scene does not occur during the official proceedings at all and Pionius' reference to Anytus and **Meletus** is not a complaint that any given person thinks it right to insult a defendant "über die offiziellen Anklager hinaus", he rather exaggerates the rhetorician's nasty words into the generalization that at Smyrna a person who finds himself in a position similar to **Socrates** is everybody's target, not only the mob's, but even of an intellectual like Rufinus.

Explicitly returning to the latter's appeal to give up his obstinacy, Pionius rhetorically asks: "were Socrates, Aristides, Anaxarchus according to you (καὶ ὑμεῖς; plural!) guilty of vainglory (ἐκενοδόξουν)?" The famous Athenian victim of ostracismus is of course a typical pagan saint, but the philosopher Anaxarchus of Abdera, a contemporary and companion of Alexander the Great, also figures regularly in catalogues of victims of **injust** and cruel treatment. In one of these his plight and courageousness are sketched by Tertullian in these terms: *Anaxarchus cum in exitum ptisanæ pilo contunderetur 'tunde, tunde', aiebat, 'Anaxarchi follem; Anaxarchum enim non tundis' (Apol. 50.6)*.⁵² Obviously Socrates, Aristides and Anaxarchus are mentioned by Pionius as victims of injustice, but there is something more to it. The rhetorical

question just quoted is completed by these words: ὅτι καὶ φιλοσοφίαν καὶ δικαιοσύνην καὶ καρτερίαν ἥσκησαν; One might conclude that the three virtues in the same order refer to **Socrates** (the philosopher), **Aristides** (the just) and **Anaxarchus** (the steadfast). That is not quite satisfactory, however, for the last-mentioned virtue clearly can be ascribed to all three.⁵³

Pionius' high-handed reaction silenced Rufinus. Yet, despite the victory for philosophy, we cannot fail to observe that Pionius himself was a highly competent rhetor. His two long speeches testify to his own skill in rhetoric, and the fact that he included them in his own σύγγραμμα (c. 1.2) shows that he expected his readers to appreciate them. For the sake of discussion, philosophy could still be opposed to rhetoric; in practice, philosophers had often become indistinguishable from exponents of the higher rhetoric. In the vocabulary of the third century, the words 'sophist', 'rhetor' and 'philosopher' were often used as practical synonyms.⁵⁴

Martyrium Pionii 23. The date of the martyrrium (250 A.D.) has now been definitely settled by T. Barnes, who rightly pointed to the reference to the emperor Gordian (238-244) in c. 9.4, and who also noted that the martyrrium is the only available source which gives the gentilicium of Decius' colleague in the consulate, **Gratus**.⁵⁵ However, Barnes has not observed that the day of Pionius' death as given in the Greek version, πρὸ τεσσάρων εἰδῶν Μαρτίων ... ἡμέρᾳ σαββάτῳ, cannot be right. When February 23, the day of Pionius' arrest, is a Saturday (c. 2, 3), March 12 cannot fall on a Saturday as well. Since it is certain that in 250 A.D. February 23 fell on a **Saturday**,⁵⁶ the day of Pionius' death as indicated in this paragraph must be wrong. The mistake is probably due to repeated mention of a Saturday in the beginning of the martyrrium. Now the Latin version makes the same mistake as the Greek one (die *Sabbati*), but the Armenian translation has the right day: "am Dienstag" (Srapian, n. 24, p. 405). The Armenian version also calls Decius' colleague Gaius, the praenomen which is missing in the Greek version. In the final constitution of the text, the Armenian version will be of great value.

Martyrium Pionii. Generally speaking, in those *Acta Martyrum* which possess a high degree of authenticity—the 'passions historiques' in Delehaye's catalogue—the Christians who have to answer the ac-

cusations levelled against them, behave with steadfast imperturbability. They show great endurance in their refusal to comply with any form of idololatry, an endurance which is usually accompanied by a certain modesty and respect for the authorities and other people involved in the proceedings. Respect for the authorities is not surprising, it belonged to the teachings of the Church, as Polycarp said to the proconsul with a reference to *Rom.* 13.1: δεδιδάγμεθα γὰρ ἀρχαῖς καὶ ἐξουσίαις ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ τεταγμέναις τιμὴν κατὰ τὸ προσήκον τὴν μὴ βλάπτουσιν ἡμᾶς ἀπονέμειν (10.2). As for modesty and unpretentiousness, these are also qualities of which, as could be expected, the martyrs gave ample evidence.

Not so Pionius, however. In this Martyrium, a document "ou règne une vie intense",⁵⁷ the protagonist certainly is not a model of humility, on the contrary, self-confidence and even some haughtiness characterize his behaviour. He is capable to silence the crowd with a long speech (5.1), to answer the president of the committee which is supervising the sacrifices, with firm decision (8), to snub the lawyer Alexander (8), the bystanders at his imprisonment (10.6), the rhetor Rufinus (17) etc. As stated, the martyrs are often pictured as persons who cannot be disconcerted, but the measure of confidence shown by Pionius is quite remarkable and even somewhat unusual. Now this could partly be explained by a reference to his social status: he is obviously a man of some renown at Smyrna, some highly-placed persons take the trouble to try to persuade him to draw in his horns. A further reason can be found in the fact that in composing the document as we have it the hagiographer leant heavily on a memorandum left by Pionius himself (τὸ σύγγραμμα τοῦτο κατέλιπεν, 1.2).⁵⁸ We should thoroughly take account of this fact and not simply in the sense that the author of the σύγγραμμα drew a rather flattering picture of himself. There is more to it.

Right at the beginning there is the curious measure taken by Pionius to put chains around the necks of himself and his two followers. This is amply explained by Pionius personally in his answer to Alexander (6.3); no less than three purposes are aimed at with this demonstrative wearing of imitation chains. Somewhat further Polemon's urgent appeal to yield is cut short by Pionius' reminder of the task Polemon has been charged with: κεχέλευσαι ἢ πείθειν ἢ κολάζειν. ὅς πείθεις· κολάζει (8.1). Pionius evidently does not want the rules of the proceedings to be upset. A climax of self-consciousness is reached when Pionius, having been confronted with the compliance of some of his fellow-Christians, retorts: τί οὖν πρὸς ἐμέ; ἐγὼ Πιόνιος λέγομαι (10.6). The paragraphs 15 and

16 again show Pionius stressing his preference for the normal and correct proceedings: the Smyrnaeans now ought to await the arrival of the proconsul: τί ἑαυτοῖς τὰ ἐκείνου μέρη ἐπιτρέπετε; (15.3), κολάζειν ἐκελεύσθητε, οὐ βιάζεσθαι (16.6). Finally the document tells that Pionius went to his execution μετὰ σπουδῆς (21.1) and again this detail is explained by Pionius himself as serving a definite purpose: διὰ τοῦτο σπεύδω ἵνα θάπτον ἐγερθῶ (21.4).

When one takes all these elements into consideration, the wearing of the chains, the insistence on the application of the normal proceedings and finally the joyful haste to the place of execution, in all cases because of an intentional design, it is difficult to avoid the impression that Pionius is carrying out a well-conceived scenario. His predicament doubtless deserves to be called a passion, but he is not playing a passive, but a very active part in it, in fact he even seems to be directing the course of events: to put it shortly, Pionius is both the protagonist and the director of his own passion. This fascinating fact is not completely unique, for it could be paralleled by some passages in the *Martyrium Polycarpi* and especially by the final stage in Cyprian's career. The Carthaginian bishop, banished in the first phase of Valerian's persecution, having learned that Pope Sixtus had been executed, was expecting his own martyrdom every day: *et sic erant omnes dies illi cotidiana expectatione moriendi, ut corona singulis possit adscribi* (Pontius, *Vita Cypriani* 14.2). For some reason, however, the authorities toyed with the idea to deport him to Utica. In the 81st letter, the last in the collection, addressed to the clergy and people of the Church of Carthage, he informs them of his temporary departure from his *horti*. The reason deserves attention: *ceterum mutilabitur honor ecclesiae nostrae tam gloriosae, si ego episcopus alterius ecclesiae praepositus, accepta apud Uticam super confessione sententia, exinde martyr ad Dominum proficiscar* (par. 2).⁵⁹ Clearly Cyprian is very much concerned about the proper course of his imminent passion. This concern is kept up until the execution, as the fifth chapter of the *Acta Cypriani* eloquently reports.⁶⁰ Even so, compared with this, Pionius' sustained determination of purpose is much more conspicuous.

Finally, the martyrdom of Pionius is a unique document of its time. The crisis of the third century has virtually left no witnesses of life in Asia Minor in the second half of this chaotic period, but the martyrdom gives us a detailed picture of life in Smyrna in 250 A.D. The surprising fact really is that life apparently went on much the same as before. Civic

magistracies were intact, the governor came to administer justice, the rich gave their games, and the intellectuals fought their debates. At the same time, we cannot be but struck by a certain feeling of malaise. Admittedly, we see the confrontation through Pionius' glasses, but even so his opponents do not make a great impression. Pionius' contemporaries, although descendants of great sophists, evidently did not reach by half the stature of their ancestors. In stead of confronting Pionius in a debate of some standing, they had to take refuge to subterfuges to get the better of Pionius. In stead of persuasion, they had to resort to violence. In the later third century the more prominent, public features of paganism gradually faded out. An important reason is undoubtedly, as MacMullen has argued,⁶¹ the cost of the cult. But is there also not another reason? When we compare the selfconfidence of Pionius with the lack of inspiration of his opponents, we may well wonder whether economic factors are really a sufficient explanation. Do we not also have to take into account the strength of conviction of both camps? Naturally, convictions are hard to measure, but the case of Pionius—like many other martyrs—clearly demonstrates that economic factors are not enough to explain the fall of paganism. The historian will have to come to terms with the problem what made men like Pionius tick. A reductionist, economic solution will hardly be the answer.

NOTES

¹ Cf. J. den Boeft and J. Bremmer, *Notiunculae Martyrologicae*, *Vig. Chr.* 35 (1981) 43-56 and *Not. Mart.* II, *ibidem* 36 (1982) 383-402. We thank Ton Hilhorst, Annelies Kruijshoop, Georg Petzl, and Sytze Wiersma for information and advice; Georg Petzl moreover kindly allowed us to use the manuscript of the second volume of his *Die Inschriften von Smyrna*.

² Ap. *Met.* X. 18, 28, 34; note also Cassius Dio LXXVI.10.3; F. Millar, *The Emperor in the Roman World* (London 1977) 195 and *JRS* 71 (1981) 68 f.

³ Τῷ δὲ Ἀσκληπιάδῃ Τερέντιος ὁ τότε ἐπιτελῶν τὰ κυνήγια εἶπεν· Σε αἰτήσομαι κατὰδικον εἰς τὰς μονομάχους φιλοτιμίας τοῦ υἱοῦ μου. Musurillo translates: "'Terentius, who was at that time in charge of the gladiatorial hunting games, said to Asclepiades, 'After your condemnation I shall ask for you to compete in single combat with my son' '". The mistranslation is also noted by J./L. Robert, *Fouilles d'Amyzon en Carie I* (Paris 1983) 263. For ἐπιτελεῖν, the technical term for the giving of games, see L. Robert, *Les gladiateurs dans l'Orient grec* (Paris 1940) 280. For the close connection of beast-hunts and gladiatorial combats, cf. Robert, *ibidem*, 309-312. For φιλοτιμία as *munus* or liturgy, cf. Robert, *ibidem*, 275-280 and *Hellenica III* (1946) 125-6 (actually quoting this passage).

- ⁴ Cf. H. W. Pleket, Licht uit Leuven over de Romeinse *jeugd*, *Lampas* 12 (1979) 173-192; K. J. Rigsby, An Imperial Letter at Balbura, *AJPh* 100 (1979) 401-407.
- ⁵ Cf. J. Deininger, *Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit* (München/Berlin 1965) 59 ("Provinzialfestspiel"); L. Robert, *Hellenica* V (1948) 81-2 (an example of a private liturgy).
- ⁶ For this oath, see now R. M. Grant, Sacrifices and Oaths as Required of Early Christians, in idem, *Christian Beginnings: Apocalypse to History* (London 1983) Ch. VI (= *Festschrift J. Quasten I*, Münster/W. 1973, 12-17). However, his account of the early history of the oath is unsatisfactory, cf. St. Weinstock, *Divus Julius* (Oxford 1971) 215 ff.
- ⁷ B. Dehandschutter, *Martyrium Polycarpi. Een literair-historische studie* (Leuven 1979).
- ⁸ *AB* 25 (1906) 358.
- ⁹ In the *Martyrologium Romanum* Polycarp's feast day is the 26th of January.
- ¹⁰ Eb. Nestle, Eine kleine Interpretationsverschiedenheit im Martyrium des Polycarp, *ZNW* 4 (1903) 345/6.
- ¹¹ But the final position presumably is more emphatic, cf. R. Kühner-B. Gerth, *Satzlehre* II, 597; E. Schwyzer, *Syntax*, 450-452; J. D. Denniston, *Greek Prose Style* (Oxford 1952) 44 ff.; J. Carrière, *Stylistique grecque* (Paris 1967) 83 ff.
- ¹² Cf. G. E. M. de Sainte Croix, Why were the Early Christians persecuted?, in M. I. Finley (ed.), *Studies in Ancient Society* (London 1974) 210-249, esp. 223; R. Freudenberger, *Das Verhalten der römischen Behörden gegen die Christen im 2. Jahrhundert* = Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte, vol. 52 (München 1967) 235-241; see also Millar, *Emperor in the Roman World*, 556 ff.
- ¹³ The second time he adds: *λοιδορήσων τὸν Χριστόν*. This can be paralleled by another element in Pliny's *actus*: *Qui negabant esse se Christianos aut fuisse, cum ... praeterea male dicerent Christo, ... dimittendos putavi* (Ep. 96.5).
- ¹⁴ Th. Zahn, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Band VI* (Leipzig 1910) 550-1.
- ¹⁵ C. E. B. Cranfield, *Commentary on Romans* [ICC] (Edinburgh 1979) 638.
- ¹⁶ Cf. *Apostolus communicare nos sanctorum memoriis docuit: tu eas damnare coegisti*. (Hilarius, *Lib. contra Const. Imp.* 27, PL 10.602A).
- ¹⁷ A clear example of this meaning for the substantive *byiara* is provided in Theodoretus, *Hist. Eccl.* 2.7.2: *τὴν ἐν τοῖς θεοῖς δόγμασιν ὑγίειαν*. (This reference can be found in Lampe, *PGL*).
- ¹⁸ 1 *Tim.* 1.10, 6.3; 2 *Tim.* 1.13, 4.3; *Tit.* 1.9, 1.13 (ἵνα ὑγιαίνωσιν), 2.1, 2.2.
- ¹⁹ J. N. D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* (London 1963) 50.
- ²⁰ Cf. L. Robert, *Opera minora selecta II* (Amsterdam 1969) 1198, and *Studii Clasice* 16 (1974) 71 f.
- ²¹ For the subject treated in this note, see also F. Kudlien, art. Gesundheit, *RAC* 10.902-945; U. Luck, art. ὑγιής, ὑγιαίνω, *TWNT* 8.308-313.
- ²² Arndt-Gingrich-Danker s.v. δεῖ.
- ²³ Cf. Th. Ruinart, *Acta primorum martyrum sincera et selecta* (Amsterdam 1713) 140-151. For some observations on the Latin version, see L. Wohleb, Die Überlieferung des Pionios-Martyrium, *Röm. Quartalschrift* 37 (1927) 173-177; B. de Gaiffier, *Anal. Boll.* 75 (1957) 425 f.
- ²⁴ M. Srapian, Das Martyrium des hl. Pionius aus dem Altarmenischen iibersetzt, *Wiener Zs. f.d. Kunde d. Morgenlandes* 28 (1914) 376-405, esp. 393. For a similar inter-

pretation, see also H. Delehay, *Les passions des martyrs et les genres littéraires* (Brussels 1966) 27. Other examples are provided in several African passions, cf. J. S. Hanson, *Dreams and Visions in the Graeco-Roman World and Early Christianity*, *ANRW* 23.2 (Berlin 1980) 1395-1427, esp. 1424 f.

²⁵ This is one of the first instances known of a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, cf. E. D. Hunt, *Holy Land Pilgrimage* (Oxford 1982) 101.

²⁶ L. Robert, *Villes d'Asie Mineure* (Paris 1962) 290-292.

²⁷ For the combined wholesale or partial destruction by flood and fire, cf. J. Chaîne, *Cosmogonie aquatique et conflagration finale d'après la Secunda Petri*, *Rev. Bibl.* 46 (1937) 207-216; J. J. Collins, *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism* (Missoula 1974) 101 f.; J. Mansfeld, *Providence and the Destruction of the Universe*, in M. J. Vermaseren (ed.), *Studies in Hellenistic Religions* (Leiden 1979) 129-188, esp. 146 n. 52. For the probable derivation of the idea of conflagration from Iran, see most recently G. Widengren, *Leitende Ideen und Quellen der iranischen Apokalyptik*, in D. Hellholm (ed.), *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (Tübingen 1983) 77-162, esp. 78-80; W. Burkert, *Apokalyptik im frühen Griechentum: Impulse und Transformation*, *ibidem*, 235-254, esp. 242 f.

²⁸ *I. Smyrna* 295, 297; *ZGR* IV.1431; *CIG* 9897; L. Robert, *Hellenica* XI-XII (1960) 260-262.

²⁹ L. Robert, *Hellenica* X (1950) 249-253 (Akmonia), XI-XII (1960) 261 (Hierapolis), 381-384 (Ephesus), 414-439 (Eumeneia); *Nouvelles inscriptions de Sardes* (Paris 1964) 37-58 (Sardes); Nonnos et les monnaies d'Akmonia de Phrygie, *J. des Savants* 1975, 153-192, esp. 158-160.

³⁰ The coins have been repeatedly discussed and represented, see e.g. E. R. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period* II (Princeton 1953) 119 f., III (1953) fig. 700.

³¹ *Or. Sib.* 1.196-198 (repeated in 7.7-12, although not literally); the tradition is also mentioned by Julianus Africanus apud Georg. Sync. 1.38 f. Dindorf. For Jews in Phrygia, see also A. J. Marshall, *Flaccus and the Jews of Asia*, *Phoenix* 29 (1975) 139-154; A. R. R. Sheppard, *Jews, Christians and Heretics*, *Anat. Stud.* 29 (1979) 169-180.

³² Pagan knowledge of and interest in Jewish matters is also stressed by A. Hilhorst, *L'Ancien Testament dans la polémique du martyr Pionius*, *Augustinianum* 22 (1982) 91-96.

³³ E. Kurtz, *Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher* 4 (1923) 278 wanted to emend in ἀντηροχέναι, but, as Petzl (letter 2-4-84) writes us, "die Form ist vielmehr ein willkommener Beleg für einen selteneren Typus des Perfekts. E. Schweizer, *Grammatik der pergamenischen Inschriften* (Berlin 1898) 186 führt ἀπηροχότα (südl. Kleinasien) an und vermutet eine halbgelehrte Kontamination von ἀπ-αγγόχα und ἀπ-ήχα"; F. Th. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* II (Milano 1981) 302 verweist auf SB 7579,5 für ἐισηγέωχα; er gibt daneben noch viele andere Varianten. Ich habe den Eindruck, dass bei dem Eta ein Nachklang des alten ἥγαγον eine Rolle spielt".

³⁴ J. and L. Robert (n. 3), 262 n. 16; J. Maier, *Jesus von Nazareth in der talmudischen Überlieferung* (Darmstadt 1978) 259 also totally mistranslates this sentence. Musurillo's translation had been silently corrected by S. Gero, *Jewish Polemic in the Martyrium Pionii* and a "Jesus" Passage from the Talmud, *J. Jew. Stud.* 29 (1978) 164-168.

³⁵ Gero (n. 34), 167; J. H. Waszink, *Biothanati*, *RAC* 2 (1954) 391-394, esp. 394 (biothanati and necromancy). Gero, 165 n. 5 and M. Hengel, *La crucifixion dans l'anti-*

quit6 et la folie du message de la croix (Paris 1981) 71 also compare *Mart. Cononis* 4.6-7 where Jesus is called a βιοβανής. Unfortunately, however, this martyrdom is a spurious one, which was fabricated together with the *Passio* of St. Nestor; both are dependent on the *Mart. Pionii*, cf. A. v. Harnack, *Die Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* 11.2 (Leipzig 1904) 469-470, and esp. P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *Scritti agiografici II* = Studi e Testi 222 (Vatican 1962) 79-85, 112.

³⁶ As is suggested by the Roberts (n. 3) 262 n. 16. For the low status of the crucified, see Hengel (n. 35). We have consulted the English edition *Crucifixion* (London 1977). We owe our knowledge of the French edition to the kindness of the author.

³⁷ See the discussion by J. Bremmer, *The Early Greek Concept of the Soul* (Princeton 1983) 83-84.

³⁸ This is suggested by Gero (n. 34) 168, but demonstrated by A. Hilhorst, Wounds of the Risen Jesus, *Estudios Bíblicos* 41 (1983) 165-167, esp. 166 n. 5 where he compares *Il. XIV.457*; *Ov. Met.* 11.655-56,691; *Ap. Met.* 9.31; *Gospel of Nicodemus* 26; *Mart. Pionii* 13.8 (the passage under discussion).

³⁹ So, surely rightly, W. Stegeman, *RE XXI* (1952) 1287 f. For the king and the sophist, cf. A. A. Barrett, Polemo II of Pontus, *Historia* 27 (1978) 437-448; G. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford 1969) 22 f.; E. L. Bowie, *Yale Cl. Stud.* 27 (1982) 52.

⁴⁰ *IGR IV.1524*; *MAMA VII.505*; J. Reynolds, *Aphrodisias and Rome* (London 1982) 114 (on doc. no. 14).

⁴¹ Musurillo consistently translates Νεμεσείον with 'temple of Nemesis', but Smyrna worshipped a couple of Nemeses, cf. *Paus.* 7.5.3; *Mart. Pionii* c. 18.14; C. J. Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna* (Oxford 1938) 220-223; L. Robert, *BCH* 106 (1982) 376 f. with photo fig. 29.

⁴² *CIG* 3193, 3201; *BCH* 1 (1877) 55 f; *SEG* 11.653; note also the Smyranean name Hip-parchikos in *I. Smyrna* 290.

⁴³ Cf. M. Speidel, Princes as a title for ad hoc commanders, *Britannia* 12 (1981) 7-13, esp. 13 n. 31.

⁴⁴ We may compare the growing evidence for military activity in south-west Asia Minor in the mid-third century, cf. Ch. Roueché, Rome, Asia and Aphrodisias in the Third Century, *JRS* 71 (1981) 103-120, esp. 115-117.

⁴⁵ Cf. C. Habicht, New Evidence on the Province of Asia, *JRS* 65 (1975) 64-91; G. P. Burton, Proconsuls, Assizes and the Administration of Justice under the Empire, *ibidem*, 92-106.

⁴⁶ For Egypt, see most recently N. Lewis, The Prefect's Conventus: Proceedings and Procedures, *BASP* 18 (1981) 119-129 (we owe this reference to Ignace Hendriks).

⁴⁷ Ael. Arist. *Or.* 50.1 (winter), 78 (Ephesus), 85 (Smyrna), 89 (Pergamum). For the debated date of Severus, see most recently R. Syme, *ZPE* 51 (1983) 279 f.

⁴⁸ For Rufinus (father and son), cf. E. Groag and A. Stein, *Prosopographia Imperii Romani II* (Berlin/Leipzig 1936) 242; Cadoux (n. 41); 296 n. 2; L. Robert, *A travers l'Asie Mineure* (Paris 1980) 423.

⁴⁹ R. MacMullen, Sfiducia nell'intelletto nel quarto secolo, *Riv. St. It.* 84 (1972) 5-16, esp. p. 14 and note 42 (quoting the passage under discussion). In a recent paper V. Saxer also pays some attention to the altercation with Rufinus, without however proceeding to an exact analysis of the scene as such or its place within the document. Such an analysis

presumably would have precluded the author from merely ascribing this scene to a reworking of the whole document in the 4th or 5th century: "sa fonction rhétorique la dtionne comme une amplification tardive". This conclusion in any case clearly overlooks the well-attested existence of Rufinus at the time of Pionius' martyrdom. V. Saxer, *Le juste crucifié*, *Rivista di Storia e Letteratura Religiosa* XIX (1983) 189-215 (*Martyrium Pionii* 17 is treated on pp. 207/8).

⁵⁰ For a survey of this rivalry cf. H. von Arnim, *Leben und Werke des Dion von Prusa* (Berlin 1898) 1-114; H. Marrou, *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité* (Paris 1964) 314-316; G. Kennedy, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece* (Princeton 1963) 321-330; E. Champlin, *Fronto and Antonine Rome* (London 1980) 121-125 (Fronto's regret of his pupil's Marcus Aurelius conversion to philosophy; note a similar conversion in (ps.?) Virgil, *Catalepton* 5); A. D. Leeman and H. Pinkster, *Kommentar zu Cicero, de Oratore*, I (Heidelberg 1981) 135-137; H. Hagendahl, *Von Tertullian zu Cassiodor. Die profane literarische Tradition in dem lateinischen christlichen Schrifttum* (Gothenburg 1983) 106 and n. 388; K. Bringmann, *Edikt der Triumvirn oder Senatsbeschluss?*, *Epigraphica Anatolica* 3 (1983) 47-76, esp. 69 f. and 72 f. (new evidence for sophists' prerogatives). For the decline of philosophy's prestige, see G. Fowden, *The Pagan Holy Man in Late Antiquity*, *JHS* 102 (1982) 33-59, esp. 51 f.

⁵¹ E. Benz, *Christus und Sokrates in der alten Kirche*, *ZNW* 43 (1950/1) 195-224. K. Döring, *Exemplum Socratis. Studien zur Sokratesnachwirkung in der kynisch-stoischen Popularphilosophie der frühen Kaiserzeit und im frühen Christentum* = Hermes Einzelschriften 42 (Wiesbaden 1979) esp. ch. 7: *Das Beispiel des Sokrates bei den frühchristlichen Märtyrern und Apologeten* (143-161). Cf. also Th. Baumeister, "Anytus und Meletus können mich zwar töten, schaden jedoch können sie mir nicht". Platon, *Apologie des Sokrates* 30c/d bei Plutarch, Epiktet, Justin Martyr und Clemens Alexandrinus, in H.-D. Blume and F. Mann (edd.), *Platonismus und Christentum. Festschrift für Heinrich Dorrie* (Münster 1983) 58-63.

⁵² For Anaxarchus, see Diels-Kranz, *Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, nr. 72; Pease ad Cicero *ND* 3.82; E. N. Borza, *Anaxarchus and Callisthenes: Academic Intrigue at Alexander's Court*, in *Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honor of Charles F. Edson* (Thessaloniki 1981) 73-86.

⁵³ It should be noted that *δικαιοσύνη* and *καρτερία* (the choice of exactly these virtues is of course determined by the example) are quite often used within the context of philosophical doctrine, in fact they both figure in Stoicizing lists of virtues; such as *SVF* III 264, 265, 266, and 269 where *καρτερία* is defined as *ἐπιστήμη ἢ ἕξις ὧν ἐμμενέειν καὶ μὴ καὶ οὐδεντέρων*.

⁵⁴ Cf. C. P. Jones, *The Reliability of Philostratus*, in G. Bowersock (ed.), *Approaches to the Second Sophistic* (University Park Pa. 1974) 11-16 and idem, *The Roman World of Dio Chrysostom* (Cambridge Mass./London 1978) 9-18.

⁵⁵ T. Barnes, *Pre-Decian Acta Martyrum*, *JTS* 19 (1968) 509-531, esp. 529-531. The date of 250 A.D. has also always been advocated by Louis Robert, see his *Hellenica* XI-XII, 262; *Villes d'Asie Mineure*, 290.

⁵⁶ Computed from the table in E. J. Bickermann, *Chronology of the Ancient World* (London 1968) 60.

⁵⁷ Delehay (n. 24), 29.

⁵⁸ The reality of this autobiographical element has been firmly defended by Delehay o.c. 30/1.

⁵⁹ Cf. M. M. Sage, *Cyprian* (Cambridge Mass. 1975) 349.

⁶⁰ Cf. *Notiunculae Martyrologicae* I (n. 1), 49.

⁶¹ R. MacMullen, *Paganism in the Roman Empire* (New Haven/London 1981) 129.

Utrecht, Trans 14